

REMARKS

Introduction:

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 18-19, 23-34, 36-42, 47-48, 52-65, 68-70, 73-89, 91-94, and 97-105 are pending in the present application.

In the above amendments, claims 1-5, 7-12, 18-19, 23-24, 29-34, 36-41, 47-48, 52-53, 58-65, 68, 73-75, 79, 82-83, 85, 88-89, 91-94, 97-100, 102, 105 have been amended and claims 6, 14-17, 20-22, 35, 43-46, 49-51, 66-67, 71-72, 90, 95-96 have been canceled without prejudice. The above amendments to the claims include amendments made to correct for minor informalities with certain claims. For example, in claims 5, 7, 11, 18, 29, 36, 40, 47, 58, 65, 73, 82, 92, 94, 97, and 105, the limitation “exclusive or=ing” has been changed to “exclusive OR-ing.”

In the Office Action mailed 3/11/2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 30-31, 59-60, 88-89 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,252,891 to Perches (“Perches”), rejected claims 14, 16, 17, 43, 45-46, 71-72, 95-96 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,675,591 to Salzwedel et al. (“Salzwedel”), rejected claims 3-4, 32-33, 61-62, 64, 90-91, 93 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perches, rejected claims 8-9, 37-39 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perches in view of Salzwedel, rejected claims 15, 44 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perches in view of US Patent 5,428,629 to Gutman et al. (“Gutman”), rejected claims 19, 48, 74, 77, 98 under USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salzwedel in view of US Patent 5,850,526 to Chou (“Chou”), rejected claims 20-21, 49-50, 75-76, 99 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salzwedel in view of US Patent 4,494,233 to Bahr et al. (“Bahr”), rejected claims 22, 51, 100 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salzwedel, and rejected claims 66-67, 83-84 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perches in view of US Publication No. 20020101832 to Chen et al. (“Chen”).

In addition, the Examiner objected to claims 5-7, 11-13, 18, 23-29, 34-36, 40-42, 47, 52-58, 63, 65, 68-70, 73, 78-82, 85-87, 92, 94, 97, and 101-105 as reciting allowable subject matter, such indication being gratefully acknowledged.

Drawings:

Applicant has filed herewith a Letter to the Official Draftsperson submitting formal drawings to replace the originally filed informal drawings.

Specification:

Applicant provides herewith amendments to the specification. The amendments to the specification are made by presenting marked up replacement paragraphs which identify changes made relative to the immediate prior version.

The changes made are merely typographical in nature in that certain reference numbers in the specification have been changed to conform with the drawings.

Applicant believes these changes add no new matter to the application and are fully supported by the original disclosure.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102:

In the Office Action mailed 3/11/2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 30-31, 59-60, 88-89 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Perches.

With reference to independent claims 1, 30, 59, and 88, Perches does not teach nor suggest calculating both an initial checksum and a final checksum as a function of the same length field of the payload as now claimed in the limitation “calculating an initial checksum as a function of ... a length field of the payload; calculating a final checksum as a function ... the length field of the payload” as set forth in lines 3-6 of claim 1, in lines 5-8 of claim 30, and in lines 4-7 of claim 88 and similarly recited in lines 2-5 of claim 59. In addition, Perches does not teach nor suggest “calculating a final checksum as a function of a second subset of the payload” as now claimed in each of claims 1, 30, and 88 and similarly claimed in claim 59.

In contrast, Perches teaches calculating a single checksum based on fields 1-5 and 10-11, see col. 1, lines 48-51, in conjunction with Fig. 1.

In the Office Action mailed 3/11/2005, the Examiner rejected claims 14, 16, 17, 43, 45-46, 71-72, 95-96 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Salzwedel.

In view of the cancellation of these claims, these rejections are now deemed moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103:

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-4, 32-33, 61-62, 64, 90-91, 93 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perches, rejected claims 8-9, 37-39 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perches in view of Salzwedel, and rejected claims 66-67, 83-84 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perches in view of Chen.

Claim 90 has been canceled rendering its rejection moot. As for the remaining dependent claims identified above, it is respectfully submitted that each remaining dependent claim depends either directly or indirectly from a respective one of the independent claims, claims 1, 30, 59, and 88, and therefore is allowable for at least the reasons given above.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15, 44 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perches in view of Gutman, rejected claims 19, 48, 74, 77, 98 under USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salzwedel in view of Chou, rejected claims 20-21, 49-50, 75-76, 99 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salzwedel in view of Bahr, and rejected claims 22, 51, 100 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salzwedel.

Claims 15, 20-22, 44, and 49-51 have been canceled rendering their rejections moot.

Claims 19 and 48 are now independent claims and are allowable for the reasons given below. In paragraph no. 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Salzwedel does not disclose determining whether the number of payload bytes indicated by the length field exceeds a threshold, the valid frame detection further being a function of the length field determination. The Examiner further states that Chou discloses in Fig. 5 that the length field (TYPE/LEN) of a packet is compared with a threshold length value to determine factors such as whether or not data compression is needed since smaller packets requires no compression and refers to col. 7, lines 22-23 and col. 9, lines 43-54 of Chou. The Examiner then alleges that claims 19 and 48 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the reason given in the Office Action. However, it is respectfully submitted that neither Chou nor Salzwedel teaches nor suggests the claimed feature of “determining whether the number of payload bytes indicated by the length field exceeds a threshold, the valid frame detection further being a function of the length field determination” as claimed in each of claims 19 and 48. In particular, the teachings of Chou referenced by the Examiner do not teach this claimed feature. Rather, Chou merely teaches

determining whether or not a certain data field in a packet should be compressed prior to transmission by comparing the data field to a threshold but does not base the validity of a received packet as a function of the data compression determination. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 19 and 48 be withdrawn.

Claims 74-77 and 98-100 depend from an allowable independent claim and in particular depend from allowable independent claims 73 and 97, respectively; see below.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Claims 5-7, 11-13, 18, 23-29, 34-36, 40-42, 47, 52-58, 63, 65, 68-70, 73, 78-82, 85-87, 92, 94, 97, and 101-105 were objected to by the Examiner as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter and as such, claims 12, 18, 23-24, 41, 47, 48, 52, 53, 68, 73, 79, 85, 97, and 102 are now in independent form.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 8, 2005

By: W. Chris Kim
Won Tae Chris Kim, Reg. No. 40,457
(858) 651-6295

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the original set of drawings with the attached formal set of drawings.